

MAY 08 2007

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Claim 1 is amended to include the features of dependent claims 8 and 14-15. Accordingly, claims 8 and 14-15 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 16, and 19 are pending.

Applicants note that in the Response to Amendment in the Detailed Action claims 17 and 18 are acknowledged as being canceled. However, the Disposition of Claims in the Office Action Summary lists claims 17 and 18 as being withdrawn from consideration. Applicants respectfully request correction of the claim status in the next PTO communication.

Turning to the substance of the Office Action, claims 1-14, 16, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gyoten et al. (US 6746793).

The rejection is rendered moot, because claim 1 includes the subject matter of claim 15, which is not the subject of this rejection. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Furthermore, to the extent the rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons. Gyoten et al. bonds a water repellent molecule to the surface of a carbon particle. However, the reference neither discloses nor suggests bonding it to other particles as required by claim 1, namely inorganic particles comprising at least one selected from the group consisting of silica, alumina, quartz, glass, ceramics and mica. The features of claim 1 can be advantageous, in that the surface of the inorganic particles claimed have higher densities of functional groups to which the molecule can be chemically bonded. (See for example page 7, lines 8-14 of Applicants' disclosure.) As noted, the reference does not disclose or suggest the required features of claim 1, and there is no reasonable suggestion for one of skill in the art to modify the reference to arrive at claim 1 or its benefits. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection for the dependent claims.

Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stonehart et al. (JP 06-111827).

To the extent the rejection is maintained, it is rendered moot because claim 1 includes the subject matter of claim 8, which is not the subject of this rejection.

Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that the pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Favorable consideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. If any questions arise regarding this communication, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative listed below.



Dated: May 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300  
DPM/baw